## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge			Milton I. S	Shadur	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge							
CASE NUMBER			01 C 1	157	DATE		2/26/20	001				
CASE TITLE				Darryl McGowan #B-09025 vs. Michael F. Sherahan, et al								
моті	ON:		[In the following box (a) in of the motion being present	idicate the party filing nted.]	the motion, e.g., plaintiff, d	efend	ant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (	b) state briefly the nature				
DOCI	KET ENTR	Y:										
(1)		Filed motion of [ use listing in "Motion" box above.]										
(2)		Brief in support of motion due										
(3)		Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due										
(4)		Ruling/Hearing on set for at										
(5)		Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at										
(6)		Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at										
(7)		Trial[set for/re-set for] on at										
(8)		[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued toat										
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to]  FRCP4(m)  General Rule 21  FRCP41(a)(1)  FRCP41(a)(2).										
[Other docket entry] Enter Memorandum Opinion and Order. Unless the completed information regarding his prisoner's trust fund account is provided to this Court in duplicate on or before March 19, 2001, this Court will be constrained to dismiss both the Complaint and this action because of McGowan's continued noncompliance with the applicable statutory requirements (something that would create the third "strike" against McGowan under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 1915(g)).												
(11)			<del></del>	attached to the c		T		Document				
	No notices required, advised in open court.  No notices required.			!			number of notices	Number				
1												
	Notified counsel by telephone.						FR 2 8 2001	/				
	Docketing to mail notices.					1	XI.					
	Mail AO 450 Copy to juda		trate judge	1D    Compared to the control of the								
	Copy to Judg	scrinagis	]	1.1.1.1	70% now h: 20		2/2 /2001 date mailed notice	V				
SN			courtroom deputy's initials				SN					
					/time received in ral Clerk's Office		mailing deputy initials					

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

DARRYL McGOWAN #B-09025,	)			
Plaintiff,	)			
v.	)	No. 01	C 1157	
MICHAEL F. SHERAHAN, et al.,	)			Dan.
Defendants.	)			FEB 2 ETEN
MEMORANDUM OPI	INION AN	ND ORDER		~ 8 2001

Darryl McGowan ("McGowan," who is now in the custody of the Illinois Department of Corrections at its Southwestern

Correctional Center ("Southwestern")), has tendered this selfprepared 42 U.S.C. §1983 ("Section 1983") Complaint based on asserted violations of his constitutional rights while in custody at the Cook County Department of Corrections ("County Jail").

This action is essentially a repeat of his Complaint in Case No. 00 C 2299, which this Court had dismissed via its September 11, 2000 memorandum order because of McGowan's then noncompliance with the 42 U.S.C. §1997e(a) requirement of the pre-litigation exhaustion of all available administrative remedies--something that the current Complaint asserts McGowan has now taken care of

But before this Court can address this new Complaint, it is constrained to note that McGowan has not complied with the requirements of 28 U.S.C. §1915 that establish the basis for a prisoner's payment of filing fees in connection with such

(Complaint ¶III).



actions. There is no question that McGowan should know better, because he did provide that requisite information in conjunction with his 00 C 2299 lawsuit. Yet in this instance he has sent in a totally blank form of the certificate regarding his prisoner's trust fund account required from Southwestern, as well as failing to provide the printout of transactions in that account during the preceding six months.

Unless that completed information is provided to this Court in duplicate on or before March 19, 2001, this Court will be constrained to dismiss both the Complaint and this action because of McGowan's continued noncompliance with the applicable statutory requirements (something that would create the third "strike" against McGowan under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. \$1915(g)). If however the information is tendered in timely fashion, this Court will proceed with such further steps as are appropriate in light of the Complaint and applicable law.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Date: February 26, 2001

£.